



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,021	03/24/2005	Franco Sartori	MI 6055 (US)	8813
34872	7590	03/11/2009		
Basell USA Inc. Delaware Corporate Center II 2 Righter Parkway, Suite #300 Wilmington, DE 19803				
EXAMINER				
SYKES, ALTREV C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/11/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,021

Applicant(s)

SARTORI ET AL.

Examiner

ALTREV C. SYKES

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-12 and 15-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 13, 14 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20081222
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 4, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Branchesi et al. fails to disclose, teach, or suggest Applicant's currently claimed fibers comprising the currently claimed propylene polymer composition (A). Applicant believes the fibers of Branchesi et al. comprise ethylene copolymers whereas applicant is claiming a crystalline propylene polymer comprising propylene polymers I and II.

Examiner is not persuaded. Examiner is unclear as to what applicant argues to be the difference between a copolymer of propylene with ethylene and a copolymer of ethylene with propylene. As set forth in the last mailed office action, Branchesi et al. clearly sets forth the use of both positions, singly and in combination, with the choice being left up to one skilled in the art. It is noted that while Applicant argues that Branchesi et al. is directed to copolymers of ethylene and not propylene, there is provided no real evidence to support applicant's position. It is noted that applicant recites that the only difference between appellants process and the prior art reside in the temperature in which the process was carried out, and the concentration of the sulfuric acid used. (See pg. 8-9) Therefore, examiner has reason to believe that the fiber products are substantially the same.

Regarding applicant's arguments against the use of Hechenbleikner et al. (US 4,755,546), examiner notes that this reference was not relied upon for the rejections. As such, applicant's arguments against the reference are moot.

Regarding applicants' argument against the use of *In re Aller*, it is noted that applicant has not overcome the rejections as set forth in the previous office action as there is no mention of unexpected results. Further, examiner is unclear as to where the MPEP 2144 teaches that the *In re Aller* case is directed to identical processes. The pending claims of the instant application are directed to a product and not a process. Further, it is noted that applicant recites that the only difference between appellants process and the prior art reside in the temperature in which the process was carried out, and the concentration of the sulfuric acid used. (See pg. 8-9) In response to applicant's

argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., process of adding a certain concentration of sulfuric acid) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, examiner has reason to believe that the fiber of Branchesi et al. is at minimum a prima facie case of obviousness over the instant application.

Finally, applicants traverse the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with the argument that Kobylivker doesn't remedy the deficiencies of Branchesi, et al.

Examiner maintains the position as set forth above for Branchesi, et al. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-8, 13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Branchesi et al. (US 5,529,845)

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 13 Branchesi et al. discloses polyolefin fibers suitable for the production of nonwoven fabrics by spun-bonding process, having improved strength and softness characteristics. (See Col 1, lines 5-8) Polyolefin fibers are disclosed which possess a high flexibility index and/or thermowelding strength, besides presenting good yellowing and aging resistance. (See Col 38-41) Is it noted by examiner that while Branchesi et al. discloses fibers and nonwoven fabrics produced by spun-bonding process, the reference additionally defines the thermowelding strength of the fiber. In order to evaluate the thermoweldability of staple fibers, one manufactures a nonwoven fabric with the test fiber by way of calendaring under set conditions. (See Col 5, lines 5-35) Branchesi et al. discloses a high flexibility index is important to ensure nonwoven fabrics with good softness characteristics and high thermowelding strength is important to ensure nonwoven fabrics with good strength characteristics. (See Col 4, lines 31-35) Further, Branchesi et al. discloses a fiber for nonwoven fabrics comprising a polymer material additivated with organic phosphites and/or phosphonites, HALS (hindered amine light stabilizers) and optionally phenolic antioxidants. (See Col 1, lines 53-56) The said polymer material being selected from: 1) isotactic propylene homopolymers having an isotactic index greater than 90; 2) random copolymers of propylene with ethylene and/or a C₄-C₈ α -olefin; and 3) blends of homopolymers 1) with copolymers 2), or blends of at least one of the above mentioned homopolymers and copolymers with heterophasic propylene polymers. (See Col 1, lines 56-66) Branchesi et al. discloses said heterophasic polymers comprising (by weight): A) from 10 to 60 parts of a propylene homopolymer, or a copolymer of propylene with ethylene and/or a C₄-C₈

α -olefin, containing over 80% of propylene and having an isotactic index greater than 80 (Fraction A); B) from 1 to 25 parts of an essentially linear semicrystalline copolymer of ethylene with a C_3 - C_8 α -olefin, insoluble in xylene at ambient temperature (Fraction B); and C) from 15 to 87 parts of a copolymer fraction of ethylene with propylene and/or a C_4 - C_8 α -olefin, and optionally minor quantity of diene, said copolymer fraction containing from 10 to 80% of ethylene and being soluble in xylene at ambient temperature (Fraction C). Branchesi et al. also discloses that the fiber is obtained by a spinning process operating at a spinning temperature ranging from 260°C to 320°C, using polymers (1) or (2), or polymer blends (3), having MFR from 5 to 40 g/10 min. (Col 2, lines 1-22) Further, the random copolymers 2) contain a quantity of comonomer ranging from 0.05 to 20% by weight. When the quantity of comonomer exceeds 5%, said copolymers must be blended with the propylene homopolymer. (Col 2, lines 29-32) It is noted by examiner that Fraction A as disclosed by Branchesi et al. has an isotactic index greater than 80 and when mixed with Fraction B essentially a linear semicrystalline copolymer in the presence of Fraction C, would provide for a crystalline propylene composition as evidenced by Applicant's disclosure that the crystalline polymers exhibit a stereoregularity of the isotactic type. (Sec pg. 3, line 17) Therefore, the fiber of Branchesi et al. is equated to that of Applicant.

Additionally, Branchesi et al. fails to teach a content of fraction soluble in xylene at room temperature lower than 10% by weight and a value of the ratio of the polymer fraction collected at the temperature range from 25° to 95° C by TREF with xylene to the xylene soluble fraction at room temperature higher than 8. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the fraction soluble in xylene and the value of the ratio of the polymer fraction since it has been held that, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). The burden is upon the Applicant to demonstrate that the claimed value of the ratio of the polymer fraction is critical and has unexpected results. In the present invention, one would have been motivated to optimize the fraction soluble in xylene and the value of the ratio of the polymer fraction motivated by the desire to provide a fiber having both softness and strength properties. (See Col 1, lines 38-42) Additionally, Branchesi et al. discloses the solubility in xylene to be measured at ambient temperatures. (See Col 2, lines 5-15) A prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)

Finally, regarding claims 1, 2, 13 Branchesi et al. teaches the claimed invention above but fails to teach the composition having a melting temperature of 153°C or higher. It is reasonable to presume that melting temperature is inherent to the Branchesi et al. fiber. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials and/or like methods, as set forth above, which would result in the claimed property. In the instant case, Branchesi et al. discloses a similar composition to that claimed by applicant for component ii) and using like methods for the production of a nonwoven fiber and fabric.

(See Col 1, lines 50-67) The burden is upon the Applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald* 205 USPQ 594. In addition, the presently claimed properties would inherently have been present once the Branchesi et al. product is provided. Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ at 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977).

It should be noted that the recitation of “for thermal bonding” is considered to be an intended use statement and is not given patentable weight at this time since the prior art meets the structural and/or chemical limitations set forth and there is nothing on record to evidence that the prior art product could not function in the desired capacity or that there is some additional implied structure associated with the term.

Regarding claims 3, 5-8, and 19 Branchesi et al. discloses that the fiber is obtained by a spinning process operating at a spinning temperature ranging from 260°C to 320°C, using polymers (1) or (2), or polymer blends (3), having MFR from 5 to 40 g/10 min. (Col 2, lines 1-22) Further, Branchesi et al. discloses an undrawn fiber for nonwoven fabric having thermowelding strength equal to or greater than 5 Newtons. (See Col 1, lines 50-53) Examiner equates 5N to be equal to 500cN (centinewton). Additionally, Branchesi et al. discloses fibers which are tested for their capability to be thermowelded. (See Col 5, lines 33-35) The clamping force of the welding plates was 800N; the clamping time was 1 second; and the temperature of the plates was 150° C. (See Col 5, lines 57-60) Branchesi et al. also discloses the spinning process of the fibers be carried out at a temperature where both the extruder and the die during processing of the polymers ranges from 260°C to 320°C. (See Col 4, lines 35-37 and 62-63)

Regarding claim 4, Branchesi et al. fails to teach the difference in the ethylene content between polymer I) and polymer IIa) is at least 1 percentage unit with respect to the weight of the (co)polymer concerned. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the ethylene content since it has been held that, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). The burden is upon the Applicant to demonstrate that the claimed ethylene content is critical and has unexpected results. In the present invention, one would have been motivated to optimize the ethylene content motivated by the desire to provide a fiber having both softness and strength properties. (See Col 1, lines 38-42)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branchesi et al. (US 5,529,845) in view of Kobylivker et al. (US 5,607,798)

Regarding claim 14 Branchesi et al. discloses polyolefin fibers suitable for the production of nonwoven fabrics by spun-bonding process, having improved strength and softness characteristics. (See Col 1, lines 5-8) Polyolefin fibers are disclosed which possess a high flexibility index and/or thermowelding strength, besides presenting good yellowing and aging resistance. (See Col 38-41) Is it noted by examiner that while Branchesi et al. discloses fibers and nonwoven fabrics produced by spun-bonding process, the reference additionally defines the thermowelding strength of the fiber. In order to evaluate the thermoweldability of staple fibers, one manufactures a nonwoven fabric with the test fiber by way of calendaring under set conditions. (See Col 5, lines 5-35) Branchesi et al. discloses a high flexibility index is important to ensure nonwoven fabrics with good softness characteristics and high thermowelding strength is important to ensure nonwoven fabrics with good strength characteristics. (See Col 4, lines 31-35) Further, Branchesi et al. discloses a fiber for nonwoven fabrics comprising a polymer material additivated with organic phosphites and/or phosphonites, HALS (hindered amine light stabilizers) and optionally phenolic antioxidants. (See Col 1, lines 53-56) The said polymer material being selected from: 1) isotactic propylene homopolymers having an isotactic index greater than 90; 2) random copolymers of propylene with ethylene and/or a C₄-C₈ α -olefin; and 3) blends of homopolymers 1) with copolymers 2), or blends of at least one of the above mentioned homopolymers and copolymers with heterophasic propylene polymers. (See Col 1, lines 56-66) Branchesi et al. discloses said heterophasic

polymers comprising (by weight): A) from 10 to 60 parts of a propylene homopolymer, or a copolymer of propylene with ethylene and/or a C₄-C₈ α -olefin, containing over 80% of propylene and having an isotactic index greater than 80 (Fraction A); B) from 1 to 25 parts of an essentially linear semicrystalline copolymer of ethylene with a C₃-C₈ α -olefin, insoluble in xylene at ambient temperature (Fraction B); and C) from 15 to 87 parts of a copolymer fraction of ethylene with propylene and/or a C₄-C₈ α -olefin, and optionally minor quantity of diene, said copolymer fraction containing from 10 to 80% of ethylene and being soluble in xylene at ambient temperature (Fraction C). Branchesi et al. also discloses that the fiber is obtained by a spinning process operating at a spinning temperature ranging from 260°C to 320°C, using polymers (1) or (2), or polymer blends (3), having MFR from 5 to 40 g/10 min. (Col 2, lines 1-22) Further, the random copolymers 2) contain a quantity of comonomer ranging from 0.05 to 20% by weight. When the quantity of comonomer exceeds 5%, said copolymers must be blended with the propylene homopolymer. (Col 2, lines 29-32) It is noted by examiner that Fraction A as disclosed by Branchesi et al. has an isotactic index greater than 80 and when mixed with Fraction B essentially a linear semicrystalline copolymer in the presence of Fraction C, would provide for a crystalline propylene composition as evidenced by Applicant's disclosure that the crystalline polymers exhibit a stereoregularity of the isotactic type. (See pg. 3, line 17) While Branchesi et al. is silent as to the composition having a melting temperature of 153°C or higher. Examiner has reason to believe that melting temperature as claimed by applicant is provided for by the Branchesi et al. fiber. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials and/or like methods, as set forth

above, which would result in the claimed property. Therefore, the fiber of Branchesi et al. is equated to that of Applicant.

Branchesi et al. fails to teach a content of fraction soluble in xylene at room temperature lower than 10% by weight and a value of the ratio of the polymer fraction collected at the temperature range from 25° to 95° C by TREF with xylene to the xylene soluble fraction at room temperature higher than 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the fraction soluble in xylene and the value of the ratio of the polymer fraction since it has been held that, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). The burden is upon the Applicant to demonstrate that the claimed value of the ratio of the polymer fraction is critical and has unexpected results. In the present invention, one would have been motivated to optimize the fraction soluble in xylene and the value of the ratio of the polymer fraction motivated by the desire to provide a fiber having both softness and strength properties. (See Col 1, lines 38-42)

Branchesi et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above, but the reference fails to teach a composite non-woven fabric comprising two or more layers wherein at least one layer is made of thermally bonded non-woven fabric as set forth above.

Kobylyvker et al. discloses fibers and the nonwoven fabric or web which is formed from such fibers of a thermoplastic resin, and laminates using such a web as a

component. (See Col 1, lines 13-16) Kobylivker et al. also discloses a very strong yet soft nonwoven polypropylene fiber and a fabric which is a web of the fibers which are produced from a blend of polyolefin polymers. (See Col 1, lines 40-44) One polymer is a highly crystalline polypropylene. The second polymer is a copolymer of polypropylene and polyethylene in which the ethylene has a random and block distribution, hence a "random block copolymer". Kobylivker et al. discloses the fibers and nonwoven fabric may be produced by several methods. (See Col 1, lines 62-64) Kobylivker et al. also discloses the spunbound fibers are generally bonded together to consolidate them into a coherent layer. Thermal and ultrasonic bonding are the preferred means of bonding. (See Col 4, lines 50-55) Kobylivker et al. further discloses the fabric may be used in a single layer embodiment or as a component of a multilayer laminate having a high basis weight. Such a laminate may include other spunbond layers, meltblown layers, films, glass fibers, staple fibers, paper, and other commonly used materials known to those one skilled in the art. (See Col 5, lines 1-7) Kobylivker et al. discloses a multilayer laminate may be formed by a number of different techniques including but not limited to using adhesive, needle punching, ultrasonic bonding, thermal calendaring, and any other method known in the art. (See Col 5, lines 20-25)

As Branchesi et al. and Kobylivker et al. both disclose discloses polyolefin (polypropylene and random copolymer) fibers suitable for the production of nonwoven fabrics by spun-bonding process and Kobylivker et al. discloses polypropylene and random block copolymer fibers and nonwoven fabric produced by the method of spunbonding, the art is analogous. It is noted that it would have been prima facie obvious

within the purview of 35 U.S.C. § 103 to use a combination of the spunbond layers and thermowelded layers, with the expectation of obtaining a thicker nonwoven fabric having sufficient strength to be used as garments and personal care products. Further, although Branchesi et al. does not disclose a plurality of layers, the court has held that mere duplication of parts (i.e. layers) has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. See *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960)

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALTREV C. SYKES whose telephone number is (571)270-3162. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8AM-5PM EST, alt Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Sample can be reached on 571-272-1376. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R. Sample/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/ACS/
Examiner
2/02/09